



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:	Henry M. Hund, Jr. et al.)	Examiner:	Charles A. Fox
)		
Serial No.:	10/612,324)	Filed:	July 3, 2003
)		
For:	Refuse Collection Vehicle)	Art Unit:	3652
	Having Multiple Collection)		
	Assemblies)	Conf. No.:	4056

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

November 10, 2005

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Enclosed is an Amendment/Response to an Office Action in connection with the application identified above and a postcard receipt addressed to Applicant's attorney. Please file the Response, mark the postcard with the date of receipt and return it to the undersigned attorney. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

David J. Hill
(Registration No. 28,427)
Attorney for Applicant
Chambliss, Bahner & Stophel, P.C.
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2500
(423) 756-3000

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed, with postage prepaid, to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 10, 2005.

Donna Guy
Date of signature: November 10, 2005



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Henry M. Hund, Jr. et al.) Examiner: Charles A. Fox
Serial No.: 10/612,324) Filed: July 3, 2003
For: Refuse Collection Vehicle) Art Unit: 3652
Having Multiple Collection)
Assemblies) Conf. No.: 4056

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

November 10, 2005

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 10, 2005. Claims 18-30 are pending in the application. Claim 18 has been finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,547,332 of Smith et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,204,789 of Riedl et al. Claims 19 and 21 have been finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,547,332 of Smith et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,204,789 of Riedl et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,952,890 of Armstrong. Claim 20 has been finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,547,332 of Smith et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,204,789 of Riedl et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,861,580 of Moore et al. Claims 22-24 have been finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,547,332 of Smith et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,204,789 of Riedl et al. and U.S. Patent No. 3,952,890 of Armstrong, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,026,104 of Pickrell. Claims 25-30 have been allowed. Applicants hereby cancel claims 18-24.